

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application and stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration. In view of the following remarks, the Applicant requests that the Claims be allowed and the application passed on to issuance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103:

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-37 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over US. Pub 2002/0138564 to Treptow in view of US Pub 2005/0228711 to Lahey.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for monitoring a web-based service and recites the following acts:

1. receiving automatically at a client a service reference to a status of a job in a network service;
2. adding the service reference to a bookmark list on the client; and
3. removing automatically the service reference from the bookmark list on the client when the job is completed by the network service.

To summarize, Claim 1 recites a method in which a service reference is automatically received at a client. That service reference is then added to a bookmark list on the client. The Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph [0180] of the Specification for an explanation of the phrase "service reference." As an example, provided in paragraph [0180], a service reference "may be a URL or any other convenient reference to a location where status information may be obtained." Paragraph [0181] of the Specification provides a description of a bookmark list. "The bookmark list may be a standard bookmark list provided in the browser, or it

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/923,328

-9-

may be a special bookmark list containing only service references for jobs being performed." Paragraph [0181] goes on to mention that "the bookmark list will be disposed in some storage associated with the user." As an example, "the storage could be in the hard drive for the user's imaging client." Paragraph [0181] also mentions that the bookmark list could be stored on an intranet or on the Internet. However, Claim 1 recites that the bookmark list is on the client.

Rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner, citing Treptow, paragraphs [0019]-[0023], [0041], [0059], [0062], and [0088] asserts that Treptow teaches receiving automatically at a client a service reference to a status of a job in a network service and adding the service reference to a bookmark list on the client. The Examiner is mistaken.

Paragraphs [0019]-[0023] are taken from Treptow's drawing description section for Figs. 9-13. Paragraph [0088] provides a discussion of Fig. 9. These figures illustrate a web page that includes upper level tabs 230-240 with upper level tab 240 selected. That upper level tab is labeled "Print Jobs." The selection of the print jobs tab 20 results in the display of lower level tabs 242-252. Selection of lower level tab 242 results in the display of a print queue for a selected printer. Selection of one of lower level tabs 244-246 results in the display of completed print jobs.

Paragraph [0041] provides a definition for the term "Job Status" in that it indicates the current status of a job request. Paragraph [0059] discusses various "Consumer Web pages." These pages include, among others, a print job status page. Paragraph [0062] mentions that a user can view the status of a print job by selecting a "my print status tab 136."

Nowhere in these paragraphs or elsewhere does Treptow teach or suggest receiving automatically at a client a service reference to a status of a job in a network service or adding the service reference to a bookmark list on the client. Treptow does teach the use of a client to display a web page through which the user can discern the job status of various job requests. Logically, the client in some fashion receives an URL or some other reference for that web page. However, Treptow makes no indication that the URL for the web page is received

automatically at a client or added to a bookmark list on that client. Lahey is silent on these points.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references as are Claims 2-4, which depend from Claim 1. Should the Examiner persist, the Applicant respectfully asks that the Examiner specifically identify and explain a passage in Treptow that teaches the use of a bookmark list on a client that is used to store a service reference.

Claims 5, 14, 18, and 19 are independent claims that, like Claim 1, recite acts, or system elements for implementing acts, in which a service reference is automatically received and added to a bookmarks list. As clarified above, the cited references do not teach or suggest such acts. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references so are Claims 5, 14, 18 and 19. Claims 6-13 depend from Claim 5 while Claims 15-17 depend from Claim 14 and are each patentable due their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Furthermore, Claim 5 is directed to a method for monitoring a web-based service and recites the following:

1. receiving automatically in a user's personal imaging repository in an autonomous network service a service reference to a status of a job in a job-performing network service, wherein the autonomous network service is independent from the job-performing network service and does not facilitate performance of the job at the job-performing network service;
2. adding the service reference to a bookmark list in the user's personal imaging repository; and
3. removing automatically the service reference from the bookmark list in the user's personal imaging repository when the job is completed by the job-performing network service.

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/923,328

-11-

Rejecting Claim 5, the Examiner fails to address the explicit use to the phrase "personal imaging repository". Instead, the Examiner simply addressed the element of Claim 1. Neither Treptow not Lahey mentions a personal imaging repository in an autonomous network service let alone receiving a service reference in a personal imaging repository or adding a service reference to a bookmark in a personal imaging repository. The Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph [0061] of the Specification for an exemplary definition of the "personal imaging repository."

For at least this additional reason, Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 20 is directed to a program product that includes machine readable program code for causing a machine to perform the following method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21-23 which depend from Claim 20.

Claim 24 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 5. For at least the same reasons Claim 5 is patentable, so are Claim 24 and Claims 25-32 which depend from Claim 24.

Claim 33 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 14. For at least the same reasons Claim 14 is patentable, so are Claim 33 and Claims 34-36 which depend from Claim 33.

Claim 37 is directed to a program product that includes computer readable program code, that when executed, implements the method of Claim 18. For at least the same reasons Claim 18 is patentable, so is Claim 37.

CONCLUSION:

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-37 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

By 

Jack H. McKinney

Reg. No. 45,685

April 11, 2006

Response To Office Action
Serial No. 09/923,328

-13-